



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

512-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

TWELVE OAKS MEDICAL CENTER
c/o HOLLOWAY & GUMBERT
3701 KIRBY DRIVE, SUITE 1288
HOUSTON TX 77098-3926

Carrier's Austin Representative Box
#21

Respondent Name

LUMBERMENS MUTUAL CASUALTY CO

MFDR Date Received

JUNE 15, 2006

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-06-6598-01

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary as stated on the table of disputed services: "IC failed to pay per DWC Rule 134.401...claim pays @ 75% of total charges as charges exceed \$40,000.00 stop-loss threshold. IC further failed to audit according to DWC Rule 134.401(c) (6) (A) (v)."

Amount in Dispute: \$42,175.92

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary as stated on the table of disputed services: "It is the carrier's position that the hospital admission was not 'unusually costly' or unusually extensive' & therefore does not trigger the stop loss methodology as outlined in TDI-DWC rule 134.401. It is the carrier's position that bill was appropriately using the per-diem."

Response submitted by: Broadspire on behalf of Lumberman's Mutual

Respondent's Supplemental Position Summary dated September 12, 2012: "...Please note that Thornton, Biechlin, Segrato, Reynolds and Guerra, L.C. represents the Respondent in all aspects of this matter."

Respondent's Additional Supplemental Position Summary dated April 15, 2013: "...As evidenced by the EOBs, the Respondent reimbursed the Requestor according to applicable fee schedule allowance. The applicable fee schedule allowance is a per diem amount for the length of the hospital stay...nowhere in any of the submitted documentation does the Requestor indicate the services were unusually extensive or costly or anything other than routine...In this case, the claimant underwent a lumbar surgery...No evidence submitted by the provider explains the particular complexity of the procedure performed...The Requestor has provided no justification how the admission involved unusually costly or extensive services. The medical records submitted show routine and expected treatment rendered, the costs of which are provided for in the Texas Per Diem amount."

Supplemental Responses Submitted by: Thornton, Biechlin, Segrato, Reynolds and Guerra, L.C.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
June 22 through 24, 2005	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$42,175.92	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to requests filed on or after January 1, 2003, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, 31 *Texas Register* 3561, effective May 2, 2006, sets out the guidelines for a fair and reasonable amount of reimbursement in the absence of a contract or an applicable division fee guideline.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital for the date of admission in dispute.
 - Effective July 13, 2008, the Division's rule at former 28 Tex. Admin. Code § 134.401 was repealed. The repeal adoption preamble specified, in pertinent part: "Section 134.401 will continue to apply to reimbursements related to admissions prior to March 1, 2008." 33 TexReg 5319, 5220 (July 4, 2008). Former 28 Tex. Admin. Code § 134.401(a) (1) specified, in pertinent part: "This guidelines shall become effective August 1, 1997. The Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline (ACIHFG) is applicable for all reasonable and medically necessary medical and/or surgical inpatient services rendered after the Effective Date of this rule in an acute care hospital to injured workers under the Texas Workers' Compensation Act." 22 TexReg 6264, 6306 (July 4, 1997).

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits

- 5 – the procedure code/bill is inconsistent with the place of service
- 885-999 – review of this code has resulted in an adjusted reimbursement of \$2,236.00
- W1 – workers compensation state fee schedule adjustment
- 400-001 – the inpatient reimbursement has been based on per diem, stop loss factor or billed charges whichever is less
- 975-410 – copy of provider's invoice used to determine reimbursable amount

Issues

1. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
2. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
4. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 *Texas Register* 6264. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 *South Western Reporter Third* 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services." Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each was given the opportunity to supplement their original medical disputed resolution (MDR) submission, position or response as applicable. The documentation filed by the requestor and

respondent to date will be considered in determining whether the admission in dispute is eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss method of payment. Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that "Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection..." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (6) (A) (i) states "...to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "...Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed..." Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c) (6) (A) (v); therefore the audited charges equal \$75,229.40. The division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.
2. The requestor in its position statement asserts that "claim pays @ 75% of total charges as charges exceed \$40,000.00 stop-loss threshold." The requestor presumes that it is entitled to the stop loss method of payment because the audited charges exceed \$40,000. As noted above, the Third Court of Appeals in its November 13, 2008 opinion rendered judgment to the contrary. The Court concluded that "to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved...unusually extensive services." The requestor failed to discuss or demonstrate that the particulars of the admission in dispute constitute unusually extensive services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor did not meet 28 TAC §134.401(c) (6).
3. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the requestor presumes that because the bill exceeds \$40,000, the stop loss method of payment should apply. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must **demonstrate** that an admission involved unusually costly services thereby affirming 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) which states that "Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker." The requestor failed to discuss the particulars of the admission in dispute that constitute unusually costly services; therefore, the division finds that the requestor failed to meet 28 TAC §134.401(c) (6).
4. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c) (4) titled *Additional Reimbursements*. The division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c) (4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c) (6) of this section.
 - Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of \$1,118.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (3) (ii) states, in pertinent part, that "The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission..." The length of stay was two days. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118.00 multiplied by the length of stay of two days results in an allowable amount of \$2,236.00.
 - 28 Texas Administrative Code 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (4) (B) allows that "When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate: (iv) Blood (revenue codes 380-399)." A review of the submitted hospital bill finds that the requestor billed \$384.00 for revenue code 381-packed red cells and \$732.00 for revenue code 384-Blood/platelets. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(g) (3) (D), requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor does not demonstrate or justify that the amounts sought for revenue codes 381 and 384 would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement. Additional payment cannot be recommended.
 - 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (4) (C) states "Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time." A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed \$332.50/unit for Propofol 10mg/ml, 100ml;

\$341.50/unit for Levofloxacin 500mg/100ml, 100; and \$633.00/unit for Esmolol HCL 10mg/ml, 250 ml. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for these items billed under Revenue Code 250. For that reason, reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended.

- 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (4) (A), states "When medically necessary the following services indicated by revenue codes shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%: (i) Implantables (revenue codes 275, 276, and 278), and (ii) Orthotics and prosthetics (revenue code 274)." Review of the requestor's medical bill finds that the following items were billed under revenue code 278 and are therefore eligible for separate payment under §134.401(c)(4)(A):

Charge code	Itemized Statement Description	Cost Invoice Description	UNITS / Cost Per Unit	Total Cost	Cost + 10%
81389991	TI locking cap	TI click'x locking cap for TI 3-D head	1 @ \$242	\$242	\$266.20
	TI 3-D head 4UN	TI 3-D head for TI click'x screws	1 @ \$551	\$551	\$606.10
	6.0x65MM crvd rd	6.0 TI curved soft rod 65mm	1 @ \$242	\$242	\$266.20
	8.0x30 clky scrw	8.0 TI click'x pedicle scr dual core 30mm thread length	1 @ \$586	\$586	\$644.60
	8.0x35 clky scrw	8.0 TI click'x pedicle scr dual core 35mm thread length	1 @ \$586	\$586	\$644.60
	8.0x40 clky scrw	8.0 TI click'x pedicle scr dual core 40mm thread length	1 @ \$586	\$586	\$644.60
81312878	Bn grft bmp lg	Infuse bone graft large	1 @ \$4900	\$4900	\$5390.00
TOTAL ALLOWABLE					\$8462.30

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is \$2,236.00 per diem plus \$8462.30 carve-outs for a total of \$10,698.30. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$14,243.88. Based upon the documentation submitted, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

Conclusion

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive services, and failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually costly. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c) (1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c) (4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in no additional reimbursement.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the disputed services.

Authorized Signature

Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution

April , 2013
Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.**

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.